



Applicant: Henry H. Jenkins

Examiner: C. Dexter  
Art Unit: 3724

Serial No: 09/580,411

Filed: May 30, 2000

For: COMPENSATING BLISTER DIE CUTTER APPARATUS

RECEIVED

AUG 13 2002

9213 Chillicothe Rd.  
Kirtland, OH 44094  
August 6, 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Ex Mail No. EF196782851 US

### INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Dear Sir:

Applicant in response to the latest communication in this application dated July 29, 2002 wishes to provide an interview summary regarding a telephone interview had with the examiner Clark Dexter who initiated the interview. The telephone interview was had on July 26, 2002.

As pointed out in Mr. Dexter's interview summary he offered to withdraw all rejections except the rejection of Claim 1 if applicant would cancel Claim 1 and he would then pass the case to issue. Claim 1 was discussed and counsel for applicant attempted to convince the examiner that Claim 1 was allowable for the reasons set forth in the appeal brief that has been filed in this case on behalf of applicant. The examiner was not persuaded of the allowability of Claim 1 and the interview ended by counsel for applicant advising the examiner that he would convey the offer to applicant and then promptly get back to him. The examiner did not indicate in the interview his basis for dropping the other rejections namely those under the first and second paragraphs of 35

USC 112; the anticipation rejection of Claim 3 based on the Carll reference; and the obviousness rejection of Claim 2 based on the Carll reference.

Counsel for applicant did advise applicant who declined the examiner's offer which was reported to the examiner on his voice mail. The examiner, by way of a telephone message to applicant's counsel's office, advised that he had received the message declining his offer.

Respectfully submitted,  
WOODLING, KROST AND RUST

By 

Charles R. Rust, Reg. No. 18,716  
440-256-4150

Kenneth L. Mitchell, Reg. No. 36,873  
440-256-4150